

to which the claims are directed. Approval thereof is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the reissue declaration was objected to as being defective because it allegedly failed to particularly specify the errors relied upon, and Claims 71 and 73-87 were rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration. In particular, the Office Action states that merely reciting the added Claims 71-87 in paragraph 8 of the reissue declaration is inadequate.

As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims again, and therefore recognize that a supplemental reissue declaration will have to be filed to reflect all the changes from the original application. As such time as all the claims in the application are found allowable, Applicants will submit the necessary supplemental reissue declaration.

However, with regard to the format of the reissue declaration, Applicants respectfully point out that the format of a prior reissue declaration, in particular specifying the errors and how they occurred, was objected to in the Communication dated January 25, 1994. In response to that Communication, Applicants' undersigned attorney met with the prior Examiner, Jerome Grant II, and with Edward Coles on February 3, 1994 to discuss the format of the reissue declaration. The Examiner is respectfully referred to the Examiner Interview Summary Record of that date. As described therein, Applicants' undersigned attorney explained the

differences between the original claims and the reissue claims, and specifically that no particular claim limitations in the original claims were erroneously claimed, but rather the original claims were phrased in terms of a first and second predetermined number of lines of image data, reflecting a type of data processing system then being used. It was further explained that this limitation was not required by the invention, but merely reflected the available apparatus at that time. In view of this, it was agreed at the February 3, 1994 interview that the best way to phrase the reissue declaration would be explain the background for the change (see paragraphs 7-12 of the current Supplemental Reissue Declaration) and to write out the reissue claims. It is for this reason that the current Supplemental Reissue Declaration appears in its current format.

While Applicants are willing to consider any specific language required by the Examiner, Applicants submit that the format of the present reissue declaration is proper, is the format best suited for the particular facts of this case, and is a format already approved by the Patent Office. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the reissue declaration and the consequent rejection of the claims, and submit that the current format is proper under 35 U.S.C. § 251 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.175(a)(5).

In the Office Action, Claims 71 and 73-87 were rejected over well known prior art in view of Japanese Patent

document 56-21471 (Kanayama et al.), 55-76480 (Yamanaka et al.) or 58-223954 (Matsunaga). The Office Action identifies the well-known prior art as image processing apparatus comprising means for supplying or receiving color image information and character code data to a common line or input.

As shown above, Applicants have amended the independent Claims 71, 76, 80 and 84 in terms which more clearly define the present invention, and respectfully submit that the amended claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for the following reasons.

Amended independent Claim 71 relates to an image processing apparatus characterized by comprising, among other features, developing means for (1) deriving information of plural color components from the color image information and developing the derived information into patterns of plural color component information, and for (2) developing the character code data into at least one pattern corresponding to the character code data, and combining means for combining the patterns of plural color component information and the at least one pattern corresponding to the character code data in memory means equipped for each color.

By means of these features, the present invention prevents the occurrence of a color blur which frequently

occurs when a composite signal (not yet separated into color components) and a character pattern are combined.

Kanayama et al. relates to a facsimile composite information system. As understood by Applicants, in Fig. 1, character data 32 and image data (fax-coded) read at a sender station are transmitted to a received station 2 through a common line. At the received station, the received data is separated into character data and image data by a separator 14. The separated character data is converted into its corresponding character pattern by a converter 16 while the image data is decoded by a decoder 18. The character pattern and the decoded image data are combined by frame composer 19 as shown in Figs. 2(A)-(F).

Matsunaga relates to a sender end information transmitting system. As understood by Applicants, in Fig. 1, image data (fax-coded) IM to which sender end information (character code) CT1 is appended at a fax transmitter station So is transmitted to center 5 through a line 1. The image data to which center information CT2 is further appended at the center is transmitted to a fax receiver station Rn through a line 4. In Fig. 3, by a controller 21 of the receiver station, the image data with the information CT1, CT2 are separated into the original image data IM, the sender end information CT1 and the center information CT2. The separated image data IM is decoded and the separated information CT1, CT2 is converted into patterns by CG25 and

then they are combined on a recording paper as shown in symbol C of Fig. 1.

As understood by Applicants, Yamanaka et al. relates to a character image printing apparatus which records a composite image having a character and an image as shown in Fig. 6. The character is stored in a disk memory as character font. The image as read is A/D converted by a converter 8 to output a digital signal. The digital signal is converted into dot image data by a convert/control unit 9 and the converted data is stored in a memory 10. The dot image data has areas (A0, D02) . . . (B8, E3) each area comprising 64 dots as shown in Fig. 3 and each dot comprises 4x4 sub-dots (17 types of tones) as shown in Fig. 4. A computer 1 sends code to a controller 4 and the controller 4 outputs a character pattern or dots in accordance with the code. That is, if the code identifies (0101), . . ., or (2004) (see table 1), the disk memory is referred to output a character pattern, while if the code identifies (A D0), . . ., or (B8E3), the memory 10 is accessed to output dots. The outputted pattern and dot image are combined as shown in Fig. 6.

As compared with the present invention as defined in the amended claims, none of the cited references is understood to teach or suggest the combination of color image information and at least one character pattern. Further none of the references is understood to teach or suggest the

feature of the present invention that color image information is separated into information of plural color components and then the information of plural color components is combined with at least one character pattern.

For the same reasons as Claim 71, amended Claims 76, 80 and 84 also are believed to be patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and to allow the pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 758-2400. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Cousins  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,292

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
277 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10172  
Facsimile: (212) 758-2982

A:\C2653.AMD\md